



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,262	03/14/2002	Mie Takahashi	2001-1890A	1310

513 7590 09/30/2003

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
2033 K STREET N. W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021

EXAMINER

THERKORN, ERNEST G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1723

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/019,262	Applicant(s) TAKAHASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner Ernest G. Therkorn	Art Unit 1723	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2003 and 28 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321^o may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 18-35 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,497,842 in view of each of Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689), Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700), and Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817). At best, the claims differ from claims 1-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,497,842 in reciting two regions that the liquid impermeable sheet material does not cover. Nakaya

Art Unit: 1723

(Japan Patent No. 11-044689) (Abstract) discloses spaces 9 in the coloring region, in addition to the sample addition region, enhance detection accuracy. Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700) (Abstract) discloses use of a hole in addition to the sample addition region for venting air. Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817) (Abstract) discloses tearing off portions of the moisture proof sheet for sample addition and as a confirmation window. It would have been obvious to use a second region in claims 1-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,497,842 either because Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689) (Abstract) discloses spaces 9 in the coloring region, in addition to the sample addition region, enhance detection accuracy; or because Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700) (Abstract) discloses use of a hole in addition to the sample addition region for venting air; or because Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817) (Abstract) discloses tearing off portions of the moisture proof sheet for sample addition and as a confirmation window.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be

Art Unit: 1723

patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over that which is conceded to be old on pages 1-4 of the specification in view of each of Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689), Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700), and Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817). At best, the claims differ from that which is conceded to be old on pages 1-4 of the specification in reciting use of a liquid impermeable sheet and two regions that the liquid impermeable sheet material does not cover. Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689) (Abstract) discloses a laminate protects the chromatographic strip. Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689) (Abstract) discloses spaces 9 in the coloring region, in addition to the sample addition region, enhance detection accuracy. Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700) (Abstract) discloses a moisture impermeable film allows the chromatographic test strip to be carried, handled, kept, and preserved after reaction. Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700) (Abstract) discloses use of a hole in addition to the sample addition region for venting air. Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817) (Abstract) discloses that a moistureproof sheet allows the test strip to be preserved for a long time. Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817) (Abstract) discloses tearing off portions of the moisture proof sheet for sample addition and as a confirmation window. It would have been obvious to use a liquid impermeable sheet either because Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689) (Abstract) discloses a laminate protects the chromatographic strip, or because Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700) (Abstract) discloses a moisture impermeable

Art Unit: 1723

film allows the chromatographic test strip to be carried, handled, kept, and preserved after reaction, or because Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817) (Abstract) discloses that a moistureproof sheet allows the test strip to be preserved for a long time. It would have been obvious to use a second region in which is conceded to be old on pages 1-4 of the specification either because Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689) (Abstract) discloses spaces 9 in the coloring region, in addition to the sample addition region, enhance detection accuracy; or because Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700) (Abstract) discloses use of a hole in addition to the sample addition region for venting air; or because Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817) (Abstract) discloses tearing off portions of the moisture proof sheet for sample addition and as a confirmation window.

Claims 18-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(B) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over each of Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689), Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700), and Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817). The claims are considered read on each of Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689), Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700), and Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817). However, if a difference exists between the claims and each of Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689), Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700), and Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817), it would reside in optimizing the elements of each of Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689), Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700), and Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817). It would have been obvious to optimize the elements of each of Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689), Mochizuki

Art Unit: 1723

(Japan Patent No. 10-332,700), and Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817) to enhance separation.

The remarks urge each of Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689), Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700), and Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817) does not disclose two regions that the liquid impermeable sheet material does not cover. However, Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689) (Abstract) discloses spaces 9 in the coloring region, in addition to the sample addition region, enhance detection accuracy. Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700) (Abstract) discloses use of a hole in addition to the sample addition region for venting air. Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817) (Abstract) discloses tearing off portions of the moisture proof sheet for sample addition and as a confirmation window. As such, two regions that the liquid impermeable sheet material does not cover are considered to be disclosed by each of Nakaya (Japan Patent No. 11-044689), Mochizuki (Japan Patent No. 10-332,700), and Takahashi (Japan Patent No. 11-094,817).

The remarks urge patentability based upon the omission of a water absorption part. However, the open format of the claims does not preclude the use of a water absorption part.


THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1723

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to E. Therkorn at telephone number (703) 308-0362.



Ernest G. Therkorn
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

EGT
September 26, 2003